HARQ and AMC: Friends or Foes?

Redouane Sassioui, Mohammed Jabi, Leszek Szczecinski, Long Bao Le,
Mustapha Benjillali, and Benoit Pelletier

arXiv:1606.05177v1 [cs.IT] 16 Jun 2016

Abstract

To ensure reliable communication in randomly varying and error-prone channels, wireless systems use adaptive modulation and coding (AMC) as well as hybrid ARQ (HARQ). In order to elucidate their compatibility and interaction, we compare the throughput provided by AMC, HARQ, and their combination (AMC-HARQ) under two operational conditions: in slow- and fast block-fading channels. Considering both, incremental redundancy HARQ (HARQ-IR) and repetition redundancy HARQ (HARQ-RR) we optimize the rate-decision regions for AMC/HARQ and compare them in terms of attainable throughput. Under a fairly general model of the channel variation and the decoding functions, we conclude that i) adding HARQ on top of AMC may be counterproductive in the high average signal-to-noise ratio regime for fast fading channels, and ii) HARQ is useful for slow fading channels, but it provides moderate throughput gains. We provide explanations for these results which allow us to propose paths to improve AMC-HARQ systems.

Index Terms

AMC, ARQ, Fading Channels, HARQ, Throughput, Variable-Length HARQ.

I. Introduction

AMC and HARQ are two transmission strategies commonly used in modern wireless systems to communicate over error-prone and time-varying channels. The main objective of this work

This work was submitted in part to IEEE Global Communications Conference 2016, Washington, DC, USA.

R. Sassioui, M. Jabi, L. Szczecinski, and L. B. Le are with INRS-EMT, Montreal, Canada. [e-mail: {sassioui, jabi, leszek, long.le}@emt.inrs.ca]

M. Benjillali is with the Communication Systems Department, INPT, Rabat, Morocco. [e-mail: benjillali@ieee.org]

Benoit Pelletier is with InterDigital Communications, Montreal, Canada. [e-mail: Benoit.Pelletier@interdigital.com]

The work was supported by the government of Quebec, under grant #182388.

is to compare AMC and HARQ from the throughput point of view, which is a well-established reference criterion particularly suited for transmission of delay-insensitive contents.

In broad terms, AMC consists in adjusting the transmission parameters (such as the modulation type, the coding rate, and/or the transmission power) to the channel conditions [1], [2]; these are most often defined by a predefined set of modulation/coding schemes (MCSs). The receiver selects a suitable MCS and conveys its index to the transmitter via a feedback channel.

Transmission errors, unavoidable in any practical system, are handled by the retransmission protocol known as automatic repeat request (ARQ) [3], where the receiver uses a feedback channel to inform the transmitter about a successful decoding—via a positive acknowledgment (ACK) message—or about a decoding failure—via a negative acknowledgment (NACK) message. Each NACK triggers a new *transmission round* (or a *retransmission*), and increasing their number improves reliability. In this work, we consider the retransmission protocol known as *hybrid* ARQ (HARQ) in which coding is done across the transmission rounds and thus is intimately related to the AMC for which coding and modulation are the core elements.

In more general terms, both AMC and HARQ may be seen as variable rate transmission strategies: the former, due to the explicit variation of the number of bits conveyed over the channel, the latter, due to the variability of the transmission time resulting from variable number of transmission rounds. Both are thus naturally coupled and, in this work we want to clarify to what extent this coupling should be preserved or exploited.

Therefore, although the formalism of the communication layers tend to separate the AMC from HARQ, the practice may call for their holistic view. In particular, the Long Term Evolution (LTE) standard specifies the HARQ operation as part of the media access control (MAC) layer [4, Sec. 5.4.2], whereas the channel measurements procedures are defined in the physical layer (PHY) [5, Sec. 7.2]. However, the AMC, i.e., the way the MCS should be chosen based on the reported channel measurement is unspecified and left for implementation. We will consider the AMC and HARQ as mechanisms of PHY.

The main difficulty in providing a qualitative insight into the relationship between HARQ and the AMC lies in the fact that they are affected by various elements, such as the adopted channel model, the available coding/modulation schemes, or the power adaptation strategies. It is thus critical to strike a realistic balance between the general model and the plethora of clumsy technical details of the practical systems or standards. With this idea in mind, the channel model

must be kept simple and we will consider two extreme cases of the operating conditions with respect to the channel correlation between HARQ rounds: i) in fast block-fading channels, all transmission rounds are carried out over independent fading realizations, and ii) in slow block-fading channels, all HARQ transmission rounds (of the same packet) are carried out in the same operating conditions (are thus perfectly correlated). Under these models, the relationship between AMC and HARQ becomes tractable while still allowing us to extrapolate the findings to the situations where the channel correlation is only partial – a case which is difficult to tackle analytically and a numerical approach might be necessary.

Another important point is the choice of a suitable performance criterion. The throughput seen by the upper layers provides a simple and fair comparison baseline, but ignores most of the considerations related to delay or packet loss. The former is acceptable by assuming a delay-insensitive traffic and a saturated buffer operating mode; the latter requires a few assumptions about the upper logical link control (LLC) layer taking care of all residual retransmission errors which then become irrelevant to the analysis (more on this in Sec. II-C).

The numerical examples that will illustrate our conclusions and findings will be based on a simple model of the decoding errors which may be fit to the experimental data obtained with practical decoders. We will then use simplifications to characterize the behavior of HARQ-IR when different parts of the codeword are transmitted in the different rounds [6], [7], and of HARQ-RR when each round carried the same codeword [8], [9].

The contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We provide a general model which leads to a qualitative evaluation of the relationship between AMC and HARQ. We provide the throughput expressions valid for fast- and slow-fading channel models, and compare to the formulations appearing in the literature.
- We discuss how the transmission rate should be chosen based on the observed channel state information (CSI), to maximize the throughput of AMC and AMC-HARQ for fast- and slow-fading channels.
- We prove that, in the high average signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) regime, combining HARQ with the AMC affects negatively the system throughput in fast-fading channel, and we provide an intuitive explanation of this result. We also show that HARQ is always productive for slow-fading channel.
- Finally, we propose en evaluate two strategies to enhance the performance of HARQ for

fast-fading channels which remove the throughput penalty introduced by the conventional HARQ.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The system model is described in Sec. II, where – somewhat unconventionally – Sec. II-F positions this work with respect to the literature. We found it the most appropriate because AMC and HARQ have been studied under many different modeling assumptions, and it is difficult to discuss them before the model is introduced.

The throughput analysis of AMC and HARQ is presented in Sec. III, Sec. IV, and Sec. V. The directions towards the improvement of AMC-HARQ systems are explored in Sec. VI and we present our conclusions in Sec. VII.

II. Model

A. Channel Model

We consider the communication over a block flat-fading channel, so the received signal can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{y}[n] = \sqrt{\mathsf{snr}[n]}\boldsymbol{s}[n] + \boldsymbol{z}[n], \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z}[n]$ is a zero-mean, unit-variance complex Gaussian noise, $\boldsymbol{s}[n]$ is the signal composed of N_{s} symbols carrying the encoded message, and $\mathsf{snr}[n]$ is the value of the SNR in the block-time n.

We assume that the user is granted access to the channel in predefined, non-consecutive, time blocks. The time-difference between the beginning of the blocks $\boldsymbol{s}[n], \boldsymbol{s}[n+1], \ldots$ is given by $(1+q)N_{\mathrm{s}}$. It is convenient to think about q as an integer, which should be interpreted as the number of blocks left between two consecutive transmission.

We assume also a transmission with a constant power and, thus, the SNR $\mathsf{snr}[n]$ captures the variation of the channel. The relationship between the SNRs $\mathsf{snr}[n], \mathsf{snr}[n+1] \ldots$, depends on the channel coherence time τ_{coh}, and we consider two different cases

1) **Fast fading**, where $qN_{\mathrm{s}} \gg \tau_{\mathrm{coh}}$, and then the SNRs $\mathsf{snr}[n], \mathsf{snr}[n+1], \ldots$ may be modeled as independent random variables. This corresponds to the case of fast-moving users where channel conditions change quickly from one block to another.

2) **Slow fading**, where $qN_{\rm s} \ll \tau_{\rm coh}$, and then the transmissions experience the same SNR in many subsequent blocks, i.e., $\mathsf{snr}[n] \approx \mathsf{snr}[n+1] \approx \mathsf{snr}[n+2] \approx \ldots$; this model is suitable for slowly-moving users.

In the numerical examples, we will use the Rayleigh fading so the SNR is modeled by a random variable SNR following an exponential distribution

$$p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(\mathsf{snr}) = (1/\overline{\mathsf{snr}}) \exp\big(-\mathsf{snr}/\overline{\mathsf{snr}}\big), \tag{2}$$

where $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$ is the average SNR.

B. Physical Layer (PHY): AMC and HARQ

The role of AMC consists in encoding the information bits, $\boldsymbol{b}$ obtained from the LLC, and transmitting them over the channel. We assume that the transmission rates to be adopted are taken from the set $\mathcal{R} = \{R_l\}_{l=1}^{L}$ (measured in [bits/symbols]); each transmission thus carries an encoded version of $R_l N_s$ bits. This corresponds to the reality of current systems which use predefined sets of transmission rates, each corresponding to a particular MCS supported by both the transmitter and the receiver [5, Sec. 7.2]. This is different from the approach used in [10], where the optimized rates depended on $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$. We note that the performance of the system is, of course, affected by the choice of MCSs, nevertheless, the methodology of comparison and the main conclusions we draw are valid independently of a particular choice.

The transmitter uses the rate $R_{\hat{l}}$, where $\hat{l} \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ is the MCS index sent by the receiver over the error-free feedback channel, see Fig. 1. Due to the block-fading model (1), it is enough to discretize the SNR, snr which we also assume to be perfectly estimated at the receiver, i.e.,

$$\hat{l} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} l \; \mathbb{I}_{[\mathsf{snr} \in \mathcal{D}_l]}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_l$ is the MCS *decision region* that can be adjusted in order to maximize the criterion of interest (here, the throughput). It will be formally defined later.

Another role of AMC is to prepare the upcoming HARQ transmission rounds. To this end, AMC encodes the packet into K sub-codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_K$ of equal length. The role of HARQ is to transmit successively these sub-codewords upon reception of NACK messages. For the moment, we assume that each sub-codeword occupies the whole available block $\boldsymbol{s}[n]$, thus, the information in each round is transmitted with the rate R_l determined by the AMC in the first



Fig. 1. Model of the transmission with the ARQ implemented by the LLC; AMC and HARQ belong to PHY.

round. This is an important assumption, which allows us to focus the analysis; we will relaxe it later.

In HARQ, the information packet $\boldsymbol{b}$ is sent using many channel blocks, so it is convenient to use a packet-oriented notation and denote the respective variables using subindices, e.g., $\boldsymbol{y}_t$ and snr_t will denote the channel outcome and the respective SNR of the t-th round of the packet $\boldsymbol{b}$.

The PHY-related actions terminate when ACK is received or when the final K-th HARQ round is reached. The receiver then discards the channel outcomes and sends a final acknowledgement that is shared with the LLC layer which takes over the communication process.

C. Logical Link Control Layer

In our model, the final acknowledgement of HARQ is shared with the LLC layer as shown schematically in Fig. 1. LLC ignores the details of the operations of PHY and only relies on the final ACK/NACK, implementing thus a basic form of ARQ: upon reception of ACK, the packet $\boldsymbol{b}$ is removed from the LLC buffer; if NACK is received, the contents (bits) of $\boldsymbol{b}$ are kept in the buffer. Then, a new packet $\boldsymbol{b}'$ is formed, which contains $N_{\mathrm{s}} R_{\hat{l}}$ bits ($\hat{l}$ is the MCS index obtained by the transmitter at the moment it has to form the packet $\boldsymbol{b}'$). The new packet $\boldsymbol{b}'$ may contain some (or all) of the bits from the previously "NACKed" packet $\boldsymbol{b}$ which, in general, used a rate $R_k \neq R_{\hat{l}}$.

The feedback channel carrying one-bit ACK/NACK messages at PHY and LLC is assumed to be error-free as. theoretically, these bits can be protected with arbitrary strength, whose overhead may be neglected for sufficiently large N_{s}.[1]

Since the packet is discarded from the LLC buffer only after ACK is received, there is no loss of data independently of how unreliable PHY is. We thus implicitly assumed that we deal with delay-tolerant but loss-sensitive applications, which is justified, for example, when files with critical contents are being transmitted.

Because it might not be immediately obvious, we emphasize that implementing ARQ at the LLC does not change the LLC throughput seen by the upper layers. In other words, retransmitting the NACKed packets does not degrade the throughput because this criterion is blind to which bits are actually being transmitted – the fact that the same bits are retransmitted is irrelevant in the throughput evaluation. In fact, the throughput remains the same independently of the number of allowed ARQ rounds at LLC, i.e., truncated ARQ does not change the throughput neither.[2]

This is formally stated in [12], and it holds in absence of other system-related considerations such as the communication overhead in the feedback channel, or the buffer overflow probability, which we ignore here. In our case, assuming an unlimited number of ARQ rounds leads to the lossless communication which is particularly useful from the theoretical point of view, as it allows us to make a fair comparison between various PHY strategies using a single criterion – the throughput.

D. Decoding Errors: AMC

The probability of error in the first transmission round, Err_1, depends on the experienced SNR and the adopted rate R_l, i.e., $\Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_1|R_l,\mathsf{snr}\} = \mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr})$ and it might be established experimentally for a given encoding and decoding. However, for the numerical analysis, it is

[1]In practice, the acknowledgement messages for HARQ are received with a non-zero error probability; e.g., the LTE specifies a minimum SNR requirement for reception of the ACK messages with errors no greater than 1% [11, Sec. 8.3.2.1]. On the other hand, the acknowledgement messages at the LLC are grouped for various packets and protected against errors through coding; then they are considered error-free. For tractability, we do not include these elements in our model.

[2]In practice, the addition delay induced by the retransmissions may be a source of the throughput degradation. For example, the TCP may interpret the delay as a congestion and respond by decreasing the size of the transmitted packets, which lowers the throughput.

convenient to use the parametric description of the packet error rate (PER) function

$$\mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad \mathsf{snr} < \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l} \\ \exp[-\tilde{a}_l(\mathsf{snr}/\mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l} - 1)] & \text{if} \quad \mathsf{snr} \geq \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l} \end{cases}, \tag{4}$$

where the thresholds $\mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}$ and the decay parameters $\tilde{a}_l$ should be found from the empirical/measured data. A form similar to (4) has been also used in [13], which provided tabulated values of $\exp(\tilde{a}_l)$, $\mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}$, and $\tilde{a}_l/\mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}$ for a particular class of encoders/modulators and decoders.

We found that, a common decay value $\tilde{a}_l = \tilde{a}$ allows for a compact description of the SNR-PER relationship for the same family of encoders/decoders: for convolutional codes, $\tilde{a} \approx 4$ fits well the experimental data, while $\tilde{a} \approx 15$ should be used for turbo-coded transmissions with large codewords.[3] Here, instead of matching the value of $\tilde{a}$ to a particular family of PER curves as done in [13], we treat $\tilde{a}$ as a parameter which defines how quickly the PER curve decays as a function of SNR. Its operational meaning may be defined from (4) in terms of SNR, $\Delta \cdot \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}$, necessary to achieve the desired level of the PER, $\mathsf{PER}_l(\Delta \cdot \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}) = \epsilon$, as

$$\Delta = \ln(1/\epsilon)/\tilde{a} + 1. \tag{5}$$

For example, setting $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, we obtain $\Delta = 3.3$dB for $\tilde{a} = 4$, and $\Delta = 10$dB for $\tilde{a} = 0.5$.

We also use $I(\mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}) = R_l$, where $I(\mathsf{snr}) = \mathsf{I}(S;Y)$ is the mutual information between the random variables S and Y modeling the transmitted and the received signals $\boldsymbol{s}[n]$ and $\boldsymbol{y}[n]$. This coincides with the threshold decoding of the capacity achieving codes which can be modelled with $\tilde{a} = \infty$; it is convenient because, the results are then comparable to those already presented in the literature for AMC [10] or HARQ [7].

E. Decoding Errors: HARQ

Let $\mathsf{NACK}_k = \{\mathsf{Err}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{Err}_k\}$ be the event of k consecutive decoding errors. Each error event Err_t, $t = 1, \ldots, k$, depends on the SNRs experienced in t rounds and on the transmission rate $R = R_l$ adopted in the first round. As in Sec. II-D, the probability of this event is given by the PER function $\Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_t | R_l\} = \mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{snr}_t)$ which now depends on t different SNRs. However, a multidimensional representation of the PER is not tractable, and we adopt the

[3] [13, Table I] shows the values $a_l = \exp(\tilde{a}_l)$, i.e., $\tilde{a}_l = \log a_l \in \{5.6, 4.4, 4.2, 3.9, 4.0, 3.5\}$. It is not clear how these a_l were obtained, but the PER curves in [13, Fig. 10] may be approximated using a common value $\tilde{a}_l = 4$.

simplifying approach of [14], [15] which reduces the multidimensional function to the following scalar representation

$$\mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{snr}_k) \approx \mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma}), \tag{6}$$

where the "aggregate" SNR obtained as

$$\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma} = h^{-1}\Big(\sum_{t=1}^{k} h(\mathsf{snr}_t)\Big); \tag{7}$$

the function $h(\cdot)$ and its inverse $h^{-1}(\cdot)$ depend on the encoding; i.e., on the type of HARQ.

For HARQ-RR, each codeword is the same, i.e., $\boldsymbol{x}_1 = \ldots = \boldsymbol{x}_K$, and the receiver applies a maximum ratio combining (MRC)[4] to combine the received signals $\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_k$. We thus can use $h(x) = x$, and then $\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma} = \sum_{t=1}^{k} \mathsf{snr}_k$ is the "accumulated" SNR [7]. In this case, (6) is exact, and the approximation sign may be removed.

In the case of HARQ-IR, codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_k$, $k = 1, \ldots, K$, are obtained by taking non-overlapping elements of the "mother" codeword $\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathrm{o}} = [\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_K]$.[5] As in [14], [16], [17], we will use $h(x) = I(x)$, which is concave so we guarantee that in the case of HARQ-IR $\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma} > \sum_{t=1}^{k} \mathsf{snr}_k$. That is, as expected, HARQ-IR yields smaller probabilities of error compared to HARQ-RR. For simplicity, we use $I(\mathsf{snr}) = \log_2(1 + \mathsf{snr})$; although this corresponds to a Gaussian model for S, it is done merely to simplify the modelling.

The final step requires finding the probability of the event NACK_k, and we use here the backward error implication assumption, $\mathsf{Err}_k \Rightarrow \mathsf{Err}_{k-1} \Rightarrow \ldots \Rightarrow \mathsf{Err}_1$, already proposed in [18], [19], which yields

$$\Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}_k\} = \Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{Err}_k\} = \Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_k\} \approx \mathsf{PER}_k(\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma}). \tag{8}$$

We quickly note that, although formally $\Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}_k\} \leq \Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_k\}$, the approximation (8) is very accurate and should be preferred to the very imprecise $\Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}_k\} = \prod_{l=1}^{k} \Pr\{\mathsf{Err}_l\}$, which also appeared in the literature, e.g., [20], [21].

[4]HARQ-RR is also known as "Chase combining" HARQ.

[5]Codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ are *punctured* versions of $\boldsymbol{x}_{\mathrm{o}}$; for example, $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ may consist of new parity symbols/bits in each HARQ round.

F. Relation to Previous Works

The interaction between the AMC and HARQ has raised a considerable interest in the literature. For instance, the throughput of HARQ with the AMC was analyzed in [13], [20], [22]–[25], and their delay in [26]–[30]. However, the available results do not allow us to draw clear-cut conclusions, mainly because they are based on different assumptions very often connected to a particular coding or channel models.

The difficulty is to strike a balance between the simplicity of the analysis and the generality of the conclusions. To address this challenge, we use arguably the simplest non-trivial decoding error model, and consider extreme assumptions with regard to the channel model (slow and fast fading), while all the remaining cases (e.g., correlated channels) are expected to yield intermediate results. Furthermore, we initially make no efforts to optimize the operation of HARQ, as done for example in [24], providing thus a "canonical" model for an interaction between the AMC and HARQ.

However, the main difference with the previous works is that we adopt the throughput at PHY as the unique performance criterion, allowing the LLC to handle the residual errors of HARQ or the AMC, at the cost of buffering and delay for the individual packets.

The conclusions (and the analysis) change when packet loss or delay are taken into consideration. For example, the authors of [13] analyze the LLC with *truncated* the ARQ operating on top of the AMC: under constraints on the probability of packet loss at LLC, increasing the number of the ARQ rounds allows the AMC to select rather aggressively the rates providing hence a higher throughput. In our perspective, the loss is irrelevant and the highest throughput is attained by optimizing the AMC without any constraints, letting the LLC to deal with the errors.

III. AMC

The throughput is a the long-term average number of correctly received bits per transmitted symbol. Since the errors in the AMC are block-wise memoryless, the throughput is unaffected

by the fading type (slow or fast) and we can take expectation for each block

$$\eta^{\text{amc}} \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{SNR}}\Big[R_{\hat{l}}\big(1-\mathsf{PER}_{\hat{l}}(\mathsf{SNR})\big)\Big] \tag{9}$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_{\mathsf{snr}\in\mathcal{D}_l} p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(x)\eta_l(x)\,\mathrm{d}x, \tag{10}$$

where we used (3) to obtain (9), with

$$\eta_l(\mathsf{snr}) \triangleq R_l(1-\mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr})) \tag{11}$$

being the "instantaneous" throughput defined for an SNR, snr.

The optimal SNR decision region is hence given by

$$\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}} = \{\mathsf{snr} : \eta_l(\mathsf{snr}) \geq \eta_k(\mathsf{snr}), \quad \forall k \neq l\}. \tag{12}$$

Proposition 1. *If the PER function is defined by* (4)*, the optimal decision regions are intervals* $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}} = [\gamma_l, \gamma_{l+1})$.

Proof: It is enough to show that there exists $\mathsf{snr}_{\text{o}} \geq \mathsf{snr}_{th,l+1}$ *such that* $\eta_{l+1}(\mathsf{snr}) < \eta_l(\mathsf{snr})$ *for* $\mathsf{snr} \leq \mathsf{snr}_{\text{o}}$*, and* $\eta'_{l+1}(\mathsf{snr}) > \eta'_l(\mathsf{snr})$ *for* $\mathsf{snr} \geq \mathsf{snr}_{\text{o}}$*. Then, it can be easily shown with basic algebra that there is only one value of* snr *solving* $\eta_{l+1}(\mathsf{snr}) = \eta_l(\mathsf{snr})$. ■

Indeed, in most of the practically interesting cases, the decision regions of AMC are intervals [1] with boundaries γ_l defined by the intersection of $\eta_l(\mathsf{snr})$ and $\eta_{l-1}(\mathsf{snr})$

$$R_l\big(1-\mathsf{PER}_l(\gamma_l)\big) = R_{l-1}\big(1-\mathsf{PER}_{l-1}(\gamma_l)\big), \tag{13}$$

where also, for notational convenience, we use $\gamma_0 \triangleq 0$ and $\gamma_{L+1} = \infty$.

This expression may be further simplified assuming that the probability of decoding error when transmitting with rate R_{l-1} is very small at the right border of $\mathcal{D}_{l-1}^{\text{amc}}$.[6] Then, (13) becomes

$$\mathsf{PER}_l(\gamma_l) \approx 1 - \frac{R_{l-1}}{R_l}, \quad l = 2, \ldots, L. \tag{14}$$

Here, we see that if R_l is much larger than R_{l-1}, the nominal error rate at the interval border γ_l may be quite high. For example, if $R_{l-1} = 1$ and $R_l = 2$, we obtain $\mathsf{PER}_l(\gamma_l) = 0.5$. This result may be contrasted with the "hard" limits imposed on the PER, $\mathsf{PER}_l(\gamma_l) = \mathsf{PER}_{\text{t}}$, suggested in [13] and specified by the LTE as $\mathsf{PER}_{\text{t}} = 10^{-1}$ [5].

[6]It is, indeed, the case if $\gamma_{l-1} \ll \gamma_l$ and the PER function decays quickly with snr as per (4).

Finally, we express the throughput compactly as follows:

$$\eta^{\text{amc}} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l \cdot (1 - f_{1,l}) p_l, \tag{15}$$

where

$$f_{1,l} \triangleq \frac{1}{p_l} \int_{\gamma_l}^{\gamma_{l+1}} p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(x) \mathsf{PER}_l(x)\, \mathrm{d}x, \quad p_l \triangleq \int_{\gamma_l}^{\gamma_{l+1}} p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x. \tag{16}$$

Using (14) in (5), we can calculate the border of the decision region as

$$\gamma_l = \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}\Big(1 + \frac{1}{\tilde{a}} \ln \frac{R_l}{R_l - R_{l-1}}\Big). \tag{17}$$

Therefore, not surprisingly, an increased strength of the coding (large $\tilde{a}$) moves the borders of the decision region closer to the decoding threshold, while a weak coding will result in larger γ_l; this, via (16), will also move the throughput curve to the regions of higher SNR.

A. Discussion

We note that, according to the observations in Sec. II-C, the above results hold also when ARQ is used on top of the AMC. Since a similar setup is considered in [13], it is instructive to contrast both results.

The main difference is that, according to our results, the throughput-optimal intervals defined by γ_l do not change with M the number of ARQ rounds. This is exactly the strength of the throughput criterion which does not change when ARQ is added on top of a particular PHY transmission strategy. On the other hand, [13] imposed limits on the packet loss P_{loss}, and the SNR thresholds $\check{\gamma}_l$ were adjusted by solving the equation $[\mathsf{PER}_l(\check{\gamma}_l)]^M = P_{\text{loss}}$, or

$$\mathsf{PER}_l(\check{\gamma}_l) = P_{\text{t}}, \tag{18}$$

where $P_{\text{t}} = P_{\text{loss}}^{1/M}$ is the target PER at each interval boundary $\check{\gamma}_l$. Hence, for a small P_{loss}, with a growing M it is possible to increase P_{t} and then $\check{\gamma}_l$ decreases approaching the throughput-optimal value γ_l; this effect was also observed in [13]. However, a caution is required because $\check{\gamma}_l$ should never be smaller than γ_l, which may happen using (18) for large M.

Example 1. *To illustrate the importance of the decision regions, we show in Fig. 2 the throughput of AMC for the (optimal) decision intervals based on* (14) *(as they are practically the same as with* (13)*), and based on* (18)*, for both cases* $P_{\text{t}} = 10^{-1}$ *and* $P_{\text{t}} = 10^{-2}$.



Fig. 2. The throughput η^{amc} with the decision intervals based on (14) and (18), for $P_t = 10^{-1}$ and $P_t = 10^{-2}$.

We use $L = 5$ rates from the set $\mathcal{R} = \{R_l\}_{l=1}^{L}$, where $R_l = l \cdot 0.75$. From (14)*, we find that* $\mathsf{PER}(\gamma_l) \approx 0.5, 0.33, 0.25, 0.2$*. To get an insight into the importance of the coding strength, we use $\tilde{a} \in \{4, 0.5\}$, where the weaker code throughput curve is right-shifted by ~ 6dB due to the increased borders γ_l of the decision regions, cf.* (17)*.*

Quite clearly, the strict constraints on the packet loss (small P_t) move the SNR boundaries $\check{\gamma}_l$ to the right; this decreases the throughput and is particularly notable for weak codes (here, $\tilde{a} = 0.5$). Adding more ARQ rounds (increasing M) increases P_t and moves γ_l to the left (cf. (18)*), hence improving the throughput which approaches the optimal solution derived in* (14)*.*

IV. HARQ: Slow Fading

In the case of slow-fading channels, we may assume that the SNR, snr, remains constant during many blocks $\boldsymbol{s}[n]$, which we treat together as a "super channel-block". We may then apply the same approach we already used to analyze AMC, and calculate the throughput as

$$\eta_K^{\text{harq}} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_{x \in \mathcal{D}_l} p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(x) \eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x, \tag{19}$$

where again $\mathcal{D}_l$ is the SNR decision region in which we use the transmission rate R_l, and $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(x)$ is the throughput of HARQ carried out with the rate R_l over SNR x. The main questions are: how to calculate $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(x)$, and how to find the optimal decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l$?

As to the throughput, $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(x)$, the number of channel blocks used to transmit the information packet is now variable due to the decoding errors whose probability is captured by the PER function in (4). Modeling HARQ rounds by the states of a Markov process, the beginning of the HARQ cycle corresponds to the renewal of the process. Thus, we can use the renewal-reward theorem to obtain [7], [20], [31], [32, Ch. 2.3]

$$\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{R}_l]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{T}_l]}, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathsf{R}_l \in \{R_l, 0\}$ is a random "reward" (here, the number of successfully delivered bits normalized by the number of symbols, N_s) at the end of the HARQ cycle, and $\mathsf{T}_l \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$ is a random inter-renewal time, i.e., the number of HARQ rounds.

The expectations in (20) are taken with respect to the decoding errors $\mathsf{Err}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{Err}_K$ which, conditioned on $\mathsf{SNR} = \mathsf{snr}$, are independent from one HARQ cycle to another. Thus, the reward R_l and the time T_l are also independent between cycles. This is, in fact, the necessary condition to use the renewal-reward theorem (20) [32, Ch. 2.3].

On the other hand, R_l and the time T_l are not *unconditionally* independent, because they depend on the same realization of the SNR. For this reason, the expectation cannot be taken with respect to SNR as it would imply that the SNR is independent between the HARQ cycles; while this approach may be suitable in bursty communication scenarios [33, Sec. IV.B] [34, Sec. IV], it is inappropriate in our case.[7]

The throughput can be hence calculated as [7], [20]

$$\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}) = \frac{R_l(1 - f_{K,l}(\mathsf{snr}))}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr})}, \tag{21}$$

where

$$f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr}) = \Pr\left\{\mathsf{Err}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{Err}_k | R_l\right\} \tag{22}$$

is the probability of k consecutive decoding errors conditioned on having the first HARQ round carried out with the rate R_l. These are calculated using the approach explained in (8)

$$f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr}) \approx \mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma}), \tag{23}$$

[7]A direct consequence of bursty communications assumption is that the transmissions over "better" channels require shorter times than those made over "worse" channels. This creates a coupling between the channel model and the transmission protocol [34] which is undesirable in our communication model.

where snr_k^{Σ} is obtained from (7), and thus depends on the type of HARQ. In particular, for HARQ-RR we have $\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma} = k\mathsf{snr}$, while for HARQ-IR it is obtained through $I(\mathsf{snr}_k^{\Sigma}) = kI(\mathsf{snr})$, where $I(x) = \log_2(1+x)$ (see also Sec. II-E). For notational convenience, we use $f_{0,l}(\mathsf{snr}) \triangleq 1$.

Before progressing any further, we first address the following simple question: does the throughput of HARQ increase with then number of allowed transmissions, K?

Proposition 2. *If*

$$\frac{f_{k+1,l}(\mathsf{snr})}{f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr})} \leq \frac{f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr})}{f_{k-1,l}(\mathsf{snr})}, \quad \forall k \geq 1 \tag{24}$$

then, for $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr})$ *given by* (21)*, the following holds:* $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}) \leq \eta_{K+1,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr})$*. Moreover, if there exists* k *for which the inequality in* (24) *is strict, then we obtain a strict inequality* $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}) < \eta_{K+1,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr})$.

Proof:

Our objective is to derive a sufficient condition, under which the expression

$$\eta_K = \frac{R(1-f_K)}{1+\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_k} \tag{25}$$

is increasing with K*, where the dependence on* l *and* snr *is removed from* (21) *for notational brevity. That is we require*

$$\eta_K \leq \eta_{K+1} \implies \frac{R\big(1-f_K\big)}{1+\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_k} \leq \frac{R\big(1-f_{K+1}\big)}{1+\sum_{k=1}^{K} f_k} \tag{26}$$

$$\implies f_{K+1}\big(1+\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_k\big) \leq f_K \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_k \implies \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{K+1} f_{k-1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_K f_k. \tag{27}$$

Obviously, (27) *is a necessary and sufficient condition for the throughput to be increasing with* K*. To remove the dependence on the sum, we strengthen* (27) *by imposing the inequality on each term yielding the sufficient (not necessary) condition* $f_{K+1}f_{k-1} \leq f_K f_k \quad \forall k \leq K$*, which must hold* $\forall K \geq 1$*; this is* (24)*. Any strict inequality will make the inequality in* (26) *strict as well. This terminates the proof.* ■

The above proposition rectifies the conditions exposed in [7, Sec. IV], where the "subgeometric" property $f_{k,l} < f_{1,l}^k$ was conjectured as a sufficient condition for the throughput to be increasing with K. In fact, it is not, as we may show by constructing a subgeometric relationship and yet obtaining a non-increasing throughput with K. For example: the subgeometric terms $f_2 = 0.5f_1^2, f_3 = 0.75f_1^3$ yield $\eta_2^{\text{harq}} > \eta_3^{\text{harq}}$, which invalidates the conjecture of [7].



Fig. 3. In slow-fading channels, decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ are unions of intervals. Here, $R_4 = 3$, $R_5 = 3.75$, and we assume HARQ-IR with $K = 4$. $\tilde{a} = 4$.

The value of Proposition 2 is that, if the error probabilities in HARQ satisfy the conditions (24), we can guarantee that HARQ will improve the throughput of AMC provided the same SNR decision regions are used, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_l = \mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$.

It is easy to show that the conditions in Proposition 2 are satisfied using HARQ-RR and HARQ-IR under the decoding model of Sec. II-E. Thus, HARQ will outperform the AMC in the slow-fading channels, and the gains may be larger if the decision regions (12) take into account the reality of HARQ and are redefined as follows

$$\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}} = \{\mathsf{snr} : \eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}) \geq \eta_{K,k}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr}), \quad \forall k \neq l\}. \tag{28}$$

Here, however, we may run into a difficulty because the throughput $\eta_{K,l}^{\text{harq}}(\mathsf{snr})$ is not a concave function of snr. Since then, the unique intersection condition we obtained in Proposition 1 cannot be guaranteed, the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$, in general, are non-convex sets and should be represented by the union of intervals as shown in the following example.

Example 2. *With two rates $R_5 = 3.75$ and $R_4 = 3$ – as in Example 1, and HARQ-IR with $K = 4$, we can see from Fig. 3 that each decision region $\mathcal{D}_4^{\text{harq}}$ (shaded) and $\mathcal{D}_5^{\text{harq}}$ (white) is the union of intervals. The boundary of the right-most piece of $\mathcal{D}_5^{\text{harq}}$ is shown with a black marker, where we can observe it being close to the boundary of $\mathcal{D}_5^{\text{amc}}$ (shown with a white*

marker). Moreover, in most of the practical cases the rates are relatively close to each other, then if $R_l > R_{l-1}/2$ is ensured, it means that the boundary of $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ will be very close to the boundary of $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$. Furthermore, if sufficiently "dense" set of rates $\mathcal{R}$ is available, the region of the achievable throughput is well covered.

While, in theory, the system may operate with arbitrary $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$, it is much more convenient to use intervals as in the case of AMC. In fact, using $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$ is not a bad idea since Proposition 2 confirms that the throughput will increase when using HARQ on top of the AMC.

Example 3. *In Fig. 4, we compare the throughput obtained using the AMC and HARQ with rates from the set $\mathcal{R}$ as in Example 1. Both HARQ-IR and HARQ-RR are considered with $K = 4$ rounds, where we also consider two cases for the decision regions for HARQ, namely, $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$. Two coding strengths are considered: $\tilde{a} \in \{0.5, 4\}$. As expected, the throughput of HARQ is improved with respect to the AMC even if $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$ is used. The gains of using the optimal decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ are important only for HARQ-IR; they are notable in low SNR and are pronounced for weak codes. On the other hand, in the case of HARQ-RR, we obtain $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}} \approx \mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$ and that is why we do not show two distinct curves in this case.*

V. HARQ: Fast Fading

In the case of fast-fading channels, the throughput can again be expressed using the renewal-reward theorem (20)

$$\eta^{\text{harq}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{R}]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{T}]}, \tag{29}$$

where R is the random reward. Since the SNRs vary independently from one transmission round to another (and from one HARQ cycle to another), the expectations in (29) are taken also with respect to all the SNRs affecting the transmission (unlike in (19), where the expectation over SNR_1 was taken outside of the fraction). Consequently, unlike (20), Since the rate is random from one HARQ cykle to another, the expected reward is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{R}] = \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l (1 - f_{K,l}) p_l, \tag{30}$$

where p_l is the probability of choosing the rate R_l in the first HARQ round, given by

$$p_l \triangleq \Pr\left\{\mathsf{SNR} \in \mathcal{D}_l\right\}, \tag{31}$$



a)



b)

Fig. 4. Throughput of AMC and AMC-HARQ for slow-fading channels using a) HARQ-RR, and b) HARQ-IR.

with $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ being the decision regions we have to define.

Again, $f_{k,l}$ that denotes the probability of k consecutive errors (conditioned on starting the HARQ cycle with the rate R_l) is given by

$$f_{k,l} \triangleq \Pr\left\{\mathsf{NACK}_k | R_l\right\} = \frac{1}{p_l} \int_{\mathcal{D}_l} p_{\mathsf{SNR}_1}(x) f_{k,l}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x, \tag{32}$$

$$f_{k,l}(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\{\mathsf{SNR}_l\}_{l=2}^{k}}\left[\mathsf{PER}_l(x, \mathsf{SNR}_2, \ldots, \mathsf{SNR}_k)\right]. \tag{33}$$

Both (32) and (33) require a one-dimensional integration respectively over $\mathsf{SNR}_1 \in \mathcal{D}_l$ and an

aggregate SNR (merging $\mathsf{snr}_1 = x$ with $\mathsf{SNR}_2, \ldots, \mathsf{SNR}_k$ via (7)).

Similarly, the expected number of HARQ rounds is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{T}] = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_{\mathcal{D}_l} p_{\mathsf{SNR}}(x) T_{K,l}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \overline{T}_{K,l} p_l, \tag{34}$$

where $T_{K,l}(\mathsf{snr}) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_{k,l}(\mathsf{snr})$ is the expected number of rounds with the first being carried out over $\mathsf{snr} \in \mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$, and $\overline{T}_{K,l} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} f_{k,l}$.

The throughput of HARQ is then given by

$$\eta_K^{\text{harq}} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l (1 - f_{K,l}) p_l}{\sum_{l=1}^{L} \overline{T}_{K,l} p_l}, \tag{35}$$

where both the numerator and the denominator depend on $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$, $l = 1, \ldots, L$.

For the moment, we do not make any assumption about the coding, i.e., we make no distinction between HARQ-IR and HARQ-RR.

A. Decision Regions

The regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ that maximize (35) are in general non-convex and must by represented as a union of intervals. Since this would lead to a tedious optimization problem, we restrict our considerations to the AMC-like decision regions

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}} = [\gamma_l, \gamma_{l+1}), \tag{36}$$

which, as we will see, become an insightful proxy to the optimal solution despite their suboptimality.

Denoting (35) as $\eta_K^{\text{harq}}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \triangleq [\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_L]$, we solve the following optimization problem

$$\hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}} \triangleq \max_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \eta_K^{\text{harq}}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \ldots \leq \gamma_L \leq \gamma_{L+1}, \tag{37}$$

where $\gamma_1 = 0, \gamma_{L+1} = \infty$ are adopted for notational convenience.

Since the numerator and the denominator of (35) depend on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, we will use the fractional programming approach [35, Proposition 2.1]. We define the following function

$$F(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \lambda) \triangleq \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l p_l \big(1 - f_{K,l}\big) - \lambda \big(\sum_{l=1}^{L} \overline{T}_{K,l} p_l \big), \tag{38}$$

and solve the new optimization problem

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\lambda \triangleq \underset{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, F(\boldsymbol{\gamma},\lambda) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad 0=\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \ldots \leq \gamma_L \leq \infty. \tag{39}$$

Then, the optimal solution of (37) is found examining the sign of $F(\boldsymbol{\gamma},\lambda)$ due to the simple relationships [35]

$$F(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\lambda,\lambda) > 0 \iff \lambda < \hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}, \tag{40}$$

$$F(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\lambda,\lambda) < 0 \iff \lambda > \hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}, \tag{41}$$

$$F(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\lambda,\lambda) = 0 \iff \lambda = \hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}. \tag{42}$$

Consequently, to solve (37), it is enough to solve (39) for each λ, and find λ such that $F(\boldsymbol{x}_\lambda,\lambda)=0$. The latter can be done efficiently using simple numerical methods (a bisection search, for instance). To solve (39), we differentiate (38) with respect to γ_l, and obtain the following Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) equations

$$\begin{aligned} R_{l-1}\big(1-\mathbb{E}_{\{\mathsf{SNR}_l\}_{l=2}^K}\big[\mathsf{PER}_{l-1}(\mathsf{snr}_K^\Sigma(\gamma_l))\big]\big) - R_l\big(1-\mathbb{E}_{\{\mathsf{SNR}_l\}_{l=2}^K}\big[\mathsf{PER}_l(\mathsf{snr}_K^\Sigma(\gamma_l))\big]\big) \\ = \lambda\big(T_{K,l-1}(\gamma_l) - T_{K,l}(\gamma_l)\big), \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

that may be solved for each γ_l under the constraints $\gamma_l \leq \gamma_{l+1}$, $l=1,\ldots,L$. We note that it is possible to obtain $\gamma_l=\gamma_{l+1}$; in which case the decision region is degenerate $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}=\varnothing$.

Example 4. *Considering the same set of rates $\mathcal{R}$ as in previous examples, we show in Fig. 5 the thresholds $\{\gamma_2,\gamma_3,\gamma_4,\gamma_5\}$ obtained after solving* (37)*. The optimal thresholds for the AMC, which do not depend on $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$, are shown as a reference.*

The relationship between γ_l and $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$ is quite complex, and it provides an immediate indication on how tedious it will be to find the optimal regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ (as a union of intervals). Some intuition about the potential gains of using HARQ on top of AMC may be obtained from Fig. 5a. For high (average) SNRs, the thresholds of HARQ are higher compared to the AMC, this more "conservative" choice of rates is meant to avoid errors and, hence, not to use HARQ. On the other hand, for low SNRs, the thresholds of HARQ are lower compared to the AMC: the rates are adopted in a more "aggressive" way indicating that the retransmissions would be beneficial. This becomes particularly clear with medium SNRs, where the regions degenerate and only $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_5=[0,\infty)$; this occurs with HARQ-IR for $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \in (1\,\text{dB}, 9\,\text{dB})$, and this interval is indicated with the markers on the $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$ axis.



a)



b)

Fig. 5. Optimal thresholds γ_l defining the decision regions $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}$ for fast-fading channels with a) $\tilde{a} = 4$, and b) $\tilde{a} = 0.5$. The filled circles on the $\overline{\text{snr}}$ axis indicate the value $\overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{low},l}$ such that if $\overline{\text{snr}} < \overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{low},l}$; $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}$ is not degenerate, i.e., $\gamma_l > \gamma_{l-1}$. We note that in a) we have $\overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{low},4} = \overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{low},5}$. The hollow circle indicates the value $\overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{high}}$ (common to all decision regions) such that if $\overline{\text{snr}} > \overline{\text{snr}}_{\text{high}}$; $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}$ is not degenerate.

Similar conclusions may be drawn from Fig. 5b, where the relationship is slightly more complex due to a much less steeper PER curve of the decoder.

We also observe that, for high SNRs, all decision regions are not degenerate, and we conjecture that it would be always true. We adopt the following reasoning: we know that the region $\mathcal{D}_L^{\text{harq}}$

is not degenerate because, if it was, it would not be possible to attain a throughput that is close to R_L. Now, for all $\mathsf{snr} < \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},L}$, transmitting with the rate R_L provokes an error, so we ask a question: is it more beneficial to avoid errors or to count on retransmissions? This can be answered comparing the rewards, R, associated with the selections of rates (actions). The assignment $\mathsf{snr} \in \mathcal{D}_{L-1}^{\text{harq}}$ yields an expected immediate reward of $\mathsf{R} = R_{L-1}(1 - f_{L-1,1})$; on the other hand, if $\mathsf{snr} \in \mathcal{D}_{L}^{\text{harq}}$, the reward is at most $\mathsf{R} = R_L/2$ because it takes at least two HARQ rounds. Thus, for $R_{L-1} \gg R_L/2$ and a sufficiently small $f_{l,1}$, we will assign snr to $\mathcal{D}_l$. A similar reasoning holds when $R_{L-1} \gg R_L/k$. We thus conclude that the region $\mathcal{D}_{L-1}^{\text{harq}}$ is not degenerate. Furthermore, with the same arguments for $\mathsf{snr} < \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},L-1}$, we can find that the regions $\mathcal{D}_{L-2}^{\text{harq}}$ is not degenerate.

B. Throughput

Proposition 2 answered the important question about the value of using HARQ on top of the AMC in slow-fading channels. In fast-fading channels, however, the derivations are more complicated due to the sums appearing in the numerator and the denominator in (35). To obtain answers in this case, we will consider separately the regimes of high- and low- average SNRs.

From the results in Example 4, we have already obtained an indication about the added-value of HARQ: retransmissions were more valuable in the low- than in the high-SNR regime. However, the final conclusions will be drawn by looking at the throughput.

Example 5. *The throughput obtained by adopting the decision regions shown in Example 4 is represented in Fig. 6. The results may seem surprising at the first glance, but they are completely in line with the behavior of the decision regions: the advantage of HARQ is well pronounced in low $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$. On the other hand, for high $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$, adding HARQ on top of the AMC is counterproductive. The throughput penalty is small but clearly observable, e.g., considering $\tilde{a} = 4$ and HARQ-RR, this effect occurs above 3 dB, and above 9 dB for HARQ-IR; these break-points are indicated with markers on the figure.*

We also note that using the optimized decision regions $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}$ is beneficial for AMC-HARQ-IR when the break-points move to the high-SNRs. However, this gain is moderate for strong codes ($\tilde{a} = 4$), and the general conclusion holds: there are regions of SNR for which it is counterproductive to use HARQ.

Finally, Fig. 6b shows the throughput with HARQ-IR in the range $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \in (1\,\text{dB}, 9\,\text{dB})$ *for* $\tilde{a} = 4$*, where* $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_5^{\text{harq}} = [0, \infty)$ *(cf. Example 4) implies that we effectively ignore the CSI; meaning that the adaptation to the channel is counterproductive. This observation is explained by the fact that AMC-HARQ cannot be considered as a fully adaptive transmission since it ignores the CSI after the first round. In fact, this is the source of a surprising and disappointing behavior of HARQ in high-SNRs.*

We will explain now more formally the results we have observed in the examples. We will show that, in the low-SNR regime, HARQ is more productive, but at high $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$, AMC outperforms AMC-HARQ under mild conditions on the PER curves of the decoder.

Proposition 3 (Low SNR)**.** *Denote by* $\hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}$ *the optimal throughput of HARQ based on* $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$*. There exists* $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}_{\text{o}}$ *such that, for all* $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} < \overline{\mathsf{snr}}_{\text{o}}$*,*

$$\hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}} \geq \eta^{\text{amc}}. \tag{44}$$

Proof: We denote by $\check{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}$ *the throughput of HARQ based on* $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$ *where, due to the non-optimized choice of the decision regions, we have* $\check{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}} \leq \hat{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}}$*. Since* $\lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to 0} p_l f_{K,l} = 0, l > 1$*, and* $\lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to 0} f_{K,1} p_1 = f_{K,1}$*, we compare the throughputs using the terms appearing in the limits*

$$\lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to 0} \check{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}} = \frac{R_1(1 - f_{K,1})}{\overline{T}_{K,1}}, \tag{45}$$

$$\lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to 0} \eta^{\text{amc}} = R_1(1 - f_{1,1}). \tag{46}$$

Thus, in the low-SNR regime, both HARQ and the AMC may be considered as single-rate transmission schemes (i.e., without rate adaptation). So, from Proposition 2 we have $\check{\eta}_K^{\text{harq}} \geq \eta^{\text{amc}}$*.* ■

For high $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$, the situation is slightly more involved, and we cannot use (45) because all terms $f_{K,l} p_l$ have the same limit, $\lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to \infty} f_{K,l} p_l = 0$. To compare the throughputs of HARQ and AMC, we will thus define a two-rounds HARQ (2R-HARQ) as a hypothetical HARQ transmission which, in the first round, behaves just like a conventional HARQ (and is described by the same probability of decoding error), while in the second transmission round, it guarantees



a)



b)

Fig. 6. The throughput of AMC and AMC-HARQ over fast-fading channels for a) HARQ-RR and b) HARQ-IR. The markers on the $\overline{\text{snr}}$ axis indicate the points where the HARQ throughput curves cross the throughput curve of AMC. Filled and hollow markers correspond to HARQ based on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_l^{\text{harq}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$, respectively.

that the message is decoded, i.e., $f_{2,l} = 0$. The throughput of 2R-HARQ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{\text{2r}} &\triangleq \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l p_l}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^{L} f_{1,l} p_l} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l p_l}{1 + \overline{f}_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where $\overline{f}_1 \triangleq \sum_{l=1}^{L} f_{1,l} p_l$ is the average probability of error in the first round, i.e., the probability

that re-transmissions are required, $\overline{f}_1 = \Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}_1\}$.[8] Comparing (47) and (35), we see that the throughput of 2R-HARQ upper bounds the throughput of HARQ, $\eta_K^{\text{harq}} < \eta^{\text{2r}}$.

To focus the discussion, we start with the assumption that the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ are not degenerate.

Proposition 4. *Let* $x_l \triangleq \lim_{\overline{\mathsf{snr}}\to\infty} \frac{f_{1,l}p_l}{f_{1,L}p_L}$.

If $x_l > 0$, $l = 1, \ldots, L-1$, *then there is a* $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}_{\text{o}}$ *such that, for all* $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} > \overline{\mathsf{snr}}_{\text{o}}$,

$$\eta_K^{\text{harq}} < \eta^{\text{amc}}. \tag{48}$$

Proof: Since $\eta_K^{\text{harq}} \leq \eta^{\text{2r}}$, *it is enough to prove that* $\eta^{\text{2r}} < \eta^{\text{amc}}$ *to obtain a sufficient condition for* (48). *We have*

$$\eta^{\text{2r}} < \eta^{\text{amc}} \tag{49}$$

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l p_l}{1+\overline{f}_1} < \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l(1-f_{1,l})p_l \tag{50}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l p_l < (1+\overline{f}_1)\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l(1-f_{1,l})p_l \tag{51}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l f_{1,l} p_l < \overline{f}_1 \eta^{\text{amc}}, \tag{52}$$

and by taking the limit $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to \infty$ *of both sides of* (52), *we get*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l x_{l,L} < \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_L x_{l,L}, \tag{53}$$

which is obviously true if $x_l > 0$. *Thus, for sufficiently large* $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$, $\eta^{\text{amc}} > \eta^{\text{2r}} > \eta_K^{\text{harq}}$. ■

The value of Proposition 4 is that it is obtained using solely the model of the decoding errors in the first transmission. Hence, we do not need to consider approximations with regard to the way the redundancy is introduced by HARQ. We also quickly note that, using the model of the decoding errors from (4) and [13, Eq. (8)], we obtain $x_{l,L} > 0, \forall l$, provided that the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ are not degenerate (i.e., when $p_l > 0$).

This brings us to the following question: will we be able to obtain gains by using HARQ on top of AMC if the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$ are optimized? The answer is "no", because Proposition 4

[8]This should not be confused with the average PER.

does not assume anything about the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}}$, except that there are at least two (in which case there are at least two non-zero terms x_l). This condition materializes for the high-SNR regime under the conjecture we made in Example 4.

Another interesting question is whether we can decrease the gap between η^{amc} and η^{2r} by increasing the number of rated in the set $\mathcal{R}$? The question may be difficult to answer. Nevertheless we consider here a particular and practical case where we cannot use coding rates below R_1 which is determined by the minimum implementable encoding rate (e.g., the coding rate of $1/3$ in the popular turbo-codes) and the minimum modulation rate (e.g., binary phase shift keying (BPSK)). Also, a finite size of the constellation, e.g., 16-quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM), implies that there is a maximum rate R_L which cannot be exceeded. We can manipulate, however, the granularity of the set $\mathcal{R}$, i.e., we can increase the number of rates, L, while keeping R_1 and R_L constant.

Corollary 1. *For $\tilde{a} = \infty$, keeping R_1 and R_L constant, the difference $\eta^{\text{amc}} - \eta^{\text{2r}}$ increases with L.*

Proof: We first rewrite (49) as follows

$$\eta^{\text{amc}} - \eta^{\text{2r}} = \frac{\overline{f}_1(\eta^{\text{amc}} - R_1)}{1 + \overline{f}_1}. \tag{54}$$

Then, for $\tilde{a} = \infty$, $\overline{f}_1$ is independent from L because the only source of error is the event $\{\mathsf{SNR} \in (0, \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},1})\}$. Since R_1 is fixed by assumption, and η^{amc} is increasing with L, the difference $\eta^{\text{amc}} - \eta^{\text{2r}}$ can only increase with L. ■

Although Corollary 1 does not talk about the gap $\eta^{\text{amc}} - \eta^{\text{harq}}$, according to our observations, for high-SNR regime, we obtain a η^{harq} indistinguishable from η^{2r}. Moreover, setting a practical (finite) value for $\tilde{a}$ does not change the results, and we indeed observe that the difference $\eta^{\text{amc}} - \eta^{\text{harq}}$ increases with L even if $\tilde{a} < \infty$.

C. Discussion

The presented results indicate that adding HARQ on top of the AMC may be counterproductive in terms of throughput. This finding is not only counterintuitive; but goes against the general belief that both the AMC and HARQ complement each other in their operations. We try to provide more intuition about this unusual—at first glance—behavior. We do it in two ways: first,

by exploring the temporal relationships of CSI, and second, by reinterpreting the equation in the proof of Proposition 4.

1) Temporal evolution of the channel states: Let us start with the relationship between the channel state in two different time instants assuming operation in high $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$. Then, the AMC is very likely to choose a high transmission rate, e.g., R_L. A small rate, e.g., R_1, may be chosen as well, which happens when the measured SNR, $\mathsf{snr}[n]$, falls into the interval $(0, \gamma_2)$; this event has a probability $p_1 > 0$. Let us assume that the error occurs when transmitting with the rate R_1, so the reward in time n is zero, $\mathsf{R}[n] = 0$. We can now compare the expected reward in the block $n+1$ due to the adoption of AMC or AMC-HARQ.

With the AMC-HARQ, the error is handled by the second HARQ round where the chances for a successful decoding (both for HARQ-IR and HARQ-RR), $f_{1,2}$ are high; the expected reward in this second round is thus given by

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathsf{R}[n+1]\big] = R_1(1 - f_{1,2}) \approx R_1. \tag{55}$$

On the other hand, with the AMC, the error is handled by the LLC, so the *new* packet is transmitted in time $n+1$ with the rate R_l. The expected reward in this case with the AMC in time $n+1$ is thus

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathsf{R}[n+1]\big] = R_l(1 - f_{l,1}) > R_{l-1}, \tag{56}$$

where the loose lower bound is obtained by using (14) and the fact that $f_{l,1} < \mathsf{PER}_l(\gamma_l)$.

We can see that the reward (55) due to a small probability of error, $f_{1,2} \approx 0$ (obtained thanks to HARQ), is negligible corresponding to the worst-case gain of the AMC given by (56). In other words, even if the selection of the rate R_1 occurs with a very small probability p_1, its effect propagates to the following time instants.

D. Probabilistic interpretation

Let us transform (52) and evaluate its limits

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l f_{1,l} p_l}{\overline{f}_1} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l \Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}, R_l\}}{\Pr\{\mathsf{NACK}\}} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l \Pr\{R_l | \mathsf{NACK}\} < \eta^{\text{amc}}, \tag{57}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} R_l \Pr\{R_l | \mathsf{NACK}\} < R_L, \tag{58}$$

where (58) is obtained by taking the limits of both sides of (57) for $\overline{\mathsf{snr}} \to \infty$.

If, for all $l < L$, $\Pr\{R_l|\mathsf{NACK}\} > 0$, then (58) is satisfied. This is another version of the conditions required in Proposition 4. It can be verbalized as follows: knowing that an error occurred (i.e., NACK is observed), the a posteriori probability of choosing a rate R_l, $l = 1, \ldots, L-1$ does not go to zero. This means that, for the high-SNR regime, the error event NACK provides information about the realization of the SNR which led to the error.

The most obvious interpretation of this relationship is obtained for $\tilde{a} = \infty$ with the decision regions $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{harq}} = \mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$, where $\gamma_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_l = \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},l}$ for $l > 1$. Then, the only source of error is the event $\mathsf{SNR} \in (0, \mathsf{snr}_{\text{th},1})$. Since this event occurs only when the rate R_1 is selected, we can write $\Pr\{R_1|\mathsf{NACK}\} = 1$. That is, even if the a priori probability $p_1 = \Pr\{R = R_1\}$ can be arbitrarily small, the a posteriori probability can be very large.

VI. Improving the Throughput via AMC-HARQ Interaction

With the lessons from Sec. V, we explore in this section two simple solutions to limit the throughput penalty incurred by the adoption of HARQ on top of the AMC in fast-fading channels. We do it in two steps. First, we will try to remove the source of the throughput penalty by making HARQ aware of the CSI; next, we will explore the possibility of increasing the throughput with a more advanced coding.

A. AMC-Aware HARQ: Packet dropping

The main point from the previous analysis is that, while the receiver observes the CSI, the adaptation has a very limited scope: the parameters of HARQ are fixed in the first round, and the subsequent ones ($k = 2, \ldots, K$) are not affected by the varying CSI.

In Sec. V-C, we have also identified situations where HARQ used on top of the AMC is counterproductive: suppose we observe in the k-th round the MCS index, $\hat{l}_k$. Using the AMC the reward can be close to $R_{\hat{l}_k}$, see (11). On the other hand, the reward related to HARQ depends on the first round MCS index, $\hat{l}_1$, and may be close to $R_{\hat{l}_1}$. Therefore, if $R_{\hat{l}_k}$ is greater than $R_{\hat{l}_1}$, the AMC should be used; this modifies the protocol for rounds $k > 1$ in the following manner

$$\text{if } \hat{l}_k \leq \hat{l}_1 \implies \quad \text{continue HARQ} \tag{59}$$

$$\text{if } \hat{l}_k > \hat{l}_1 \implies \quad \text{restart HARQ (drop the packet).} \tag{60}$$

In this way, we adapt the number of HARQ transmission rounds to the observed MCS indices. Quite clearly, only the performance of HARQ in fast-fading channels will be affected because, under slow-fading model, we observe $\hat{l}_1 = \hat{l}_2 = \ldots = \hat{l}_K$, and subsequently (59) applies in all rounds.

Using (60), the HARQ the number of rounds of one cycle may depend on the rate used in the cycle which follows. Thus, to calculate the throughput of the packet-dropping HARQ (HARQ-PD) we have just introduced, we cannot directly use the previous formulas based on the expected reward and the expected duration in *one* HARQ cycle.

However, this is not an issue since we are merely interested in the throughput with fixed transmission strategy parameters, and we will also use the predefined decision regions of AMC, $\mathcal{D}_l^{\text{amc}}$. Therefore, to obtain the results we show in Fig. 7, we used a Monte Carlo integration. We can appreciate that the packet dropping proposed in (60) practically eliminates the throughput loss introduced by HARQ. This is an indirect confirmation that the main source of the throughput gap was correctly identified in Sec. V-C.

B. Adaptive HARQ: Variable-Length Coding

Here, we would like to improve the throughput beyond what AMC alone can offer, especially in the high-SNR regime. We follow [36]–[40], which proposed to use variable-length coding for HARQ; the main idea of HARQ-VL is to reduce the number of symbols involved in the transmission of a packet. This can be done by decreasing the length of the codewords in rounds $k = 2, \ldots, K$.

In order to comply with the constant-length channel block assumptions we used previously, modifications are needed regarding the way the packets are encoded and transmitted in a channel block.

First, we redefine the operation of the AMC. Previously, the rate R_l was interpreted as a transmitting of one packet containing $R_l N_{\text{s}}$ bits per block. We assume henceforth that the packet contents is fixed to $N_{\text{b}} = R_1 N_{\text{s}}$ bits so selecting the rate R_l means that the transmission requires $N_{\text{s},l} = N_{\text{b}}/R_l = \ell_l N_{\text{s}}$ symbols, where $\ell_l = R_1/R_l$ is the normalized length of the codeword.[9] If we also use $R_l = lR_1$, $l = 1, \ldots, L$ (as we already did in the numerical examples), then the

[9]Equivalently, ℓ_l is the fraction of N_{s} required to transmit the packet with the rate R_l.



a)



b)

Fig. 7. The throughput obtained using packet-dropping HARQ-PD for a) HARQ-RR, and b) HARQ-IR, and using variable-length HARQ-VL, which can be implemented only for HARQ-IR.

AMC transmission with the rate R_l means that l packets are transmitted in one channel block, as done also in [13], [26], [40].

Since the relationship between the rate R_l and the length ℓ_l is bijective, it is convenient to reformulate the discussion in terms of packet length. The first transmission round of HARQ is done using codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ with the predefined length taken from the set $\mathcal{L} = \{1, 1/2, \ldots, 1/L\}$; we are thus compatible with the AMC. On the other hand, in the subsequent HARQ rounds we are

allowed to use the subcodewords $\boldsymbol{x}_k$ with arbitrary length taken from $\mathcal{L}$. Since the idea is to use shorter subcodewords in order to decrease the channel use, we may also expand the decision space and use auxiliary set of codewords lengths $\mathcal{L}' = \ell_{L+1}, \ldots, \ell_{L'}$, where $\ell_{k-1} < \ell_k, k = L{+}1, \ldots, L'$.

Since it is allowed to transmit in the same channel block the "fresh" (not transmitted) packets as well as the redundancy codewords for the NACKed packets, the operation of HARQ needs to be modified.

To do so, we assume that all packets, which are candidates for the transmission are gathered in the HARQ buffer and we index them with $h \in \{1, \ldots, H\}$, where $H \leq K \cdot L$ is the maximum number of packets we need to consider. Let $\{\ell_h\}_{h=1}^{H}$ denote the length we will assign to each packets in the HARQ buffer, where setting $\ell_h = 0$ means, de facto, that the packet is not "scheduled" for transmission.

We will maximize the instantaneous reward for a given SNR, snr. As all the packets carry N_{b} bits, we solve the following problem:

$$\{\hat{\ell}_h\} = \underset{\{\ell_h\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sum_{h=1}^{H} (1 - f(h)), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{h=1}^{H} \ell_h \leq 1 \tag{61}$$

where $f(h)$ is the conditional probability of error for the h-th packet, calculated as

$$f(h) = \Pr\left\{\mathsf{Err}_{k(h)+1} | \mathsf{Err}_{k(h)}\right\} \tag{62}$$

and $k(h)$ is the HARQ counter of the h-th packet (i.e., the number of time the packet was scheduled for transmission).

To calculate (62) we first express the probability of decoding error after $k(h)$ transmissions with the codewords' lengths $\ell_1(h), \ldots, \ell_{k(h)}(h) \in \{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}'\}$ using (6)–(7)

$$\Pr\left\{\mathsf{Err}_k | \ell_1(h), \ldots, \ell_{k(h)}(h)\right\} = \mathsf{PER}_{l(h)}(\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h)), \tag{63}$$

where, $l(h)$ is the index of the first transmission (i.e., $\ell_{l(h)} = \ell_1(h)$), and for HARQ-IR the $\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h)$ is given by

$$\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h) = I^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{\ell_1(h)} \sum_{t=1}^{k(h)} \ell_t(h) I(\mathsf{snr}_t(h))\Big), \tag{64}$$

where $\mathsf{snr}_t(h)$ is the SNR experienced by the h-th packet during the t-th round and (64) expresses the fact that the mutual information (MI) accumulation depends on the subcodeword lengths. Note that, as expected, (63) is equivalent to (6) if $\ell_1(h) = \ldots = \ell_{k(h)}(h)$.

Thus, using (8) we calculate (62) as

$$f(h) = \frac{\mathsf{PER}_{l(h)}(\mathsf{snr}'(h))}{\mathsf{PER}_{l(h)}(\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h))}, \tag{65}$$

where

$$\mathsf{snr}'(h) = I^{-1}\Big(I(\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h)) + \frac{\ell_h}{\ell_1(h)}\mathsf{snr}\Big) \tag{66}$$

is the aggregate SNR that will be experienced by the h-th packet provided it is scheduled for transmission.

After erroneous decoding of the h-th packet, signaled by a NACK message, $k(h)$ is incremented if $k(h) < K-1$ (otherwise the packet is discarded from the HARQ buffer), and $\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h)$ is updated using (64)

$$\mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h) \leftarrow \mathsf{snr}'(h). \tag{67}$$

We thus see that it is not necessary to keep track of all lengths used to transmit the packet h: observing the current SNR, snr, and knowing the triplet $\big(k(h), \ell_1(h), \mathsf{snr}^{\Sigma}(h)\big)$, for all the packets $h = 1, \ldots, H$, we have enough information to calculate the probability of error for each scheduled packet.

We note that, if all the packets in the buffer are fresh, the optimization problem (61) is equivalent to finding the throughput-maximizing rates as done for AMC when the decision regions are defined by (12). On the other hand, in presence of packets with HARQ counters $k(h) > 0$, the notion of decision regions is less clear; since they become dependent on the parameters of all the packets in the HARQ buffer via (61), the simple one-to-one relationship between the packet and the transmission rate does not exist anymore.

To make a comparison with the AMC fair, we assume that in order to have a decodable first transmission (i.e., $f(h) < 1$) we must use the length $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$. Again, this is motivated by the practical considerations: for example, using a finite-size constellation, such as 16-QAM, any transmission with rate $R > 4$ (or $\ell < R_1/4$) fails. Therefore, using the instantaneous throughput criterion, the first transmission length must be taken from $\mathcal{L}$ so we cannot exploit $\mathcal{L}'$ to improve the throughput of the AMC.

We terminate noting that the memoryless scheduling decisions obtained solving (61) are suboptimal in terms of long-term throughput. In general, finding the optimal set $\{\hat{\ell}_h\}_{h=1}^{H}$ is difficult mainly due to the dependence of the throughput on the future decisions and would have

to be solved using a framework of Markov decision process (MDP); a problem is compounded by the dimensionality of the observation space.

The numerical results we show in Fig. 7 are obtained by Monte Carlo simulations, where the set of lengths $\mathcal{L} = \{1, 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5\}$ is the same as in all previous examples, and the auxiliary set is given by $\mathcal{L}' = \{1/8, 1/12, 1/16\}$. The discrete optimization problem defined in (61) was solved by exhaustive search over the entire solution space; this is possible here due to a relatively small dimensionality of the sets $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}'$.

The improvement of the throughput of HARQ-VL comparing to AMC-HARQ is clear for high values of $\overline{\mathsf{snr}}$ despite of the sub-optimality of the objective function (61). We conducted more experiments including smaller length ℓ in $\mathcal{L}'$, but changes in the throughput we observed were not significant. On the other hand, it is was indeed necessary to use $\mathcal{L}'$ in order to improve the throughput in high SNR. This is because, under such operating conditions, the first transmission is very likely to use the shortest codewords from $\mathcal{L}$ and thus, to decrease the average transmission time, we need to use shorter codewords from $\mathcal{L}'$.

VII. Conclusions

In this work, we provided a general communication-theoretic point of view on the benefits of combining AMC and HARQ in point-to-point transmissions. Using the throughput as a comparison criterion, the main conclusions are the following: i) in slow-fading channels, the throughput increases thanks to HARQ but the improvements are very moderate, especially when AMC ignores the presences of HARQ, ii) in fast-fading channels, HARQ is beneficial only in low SNRs and is counterproductive in high SNRs, irrespectively of the adaptation efforts of AMC. Then, since HARQ provides very small (if any) throughput gains, the error-free operation may be taken in charge by the upper layer (LLC).

Following the identified sources of deficiencies of HARQ used on top of AMC, we also proposed a simple modification to the HARQ protocol, which terminates the HARQ cycle on the basis of the observed MCS. This modification can be implemented without any additional signaling or change at PHY, and removes the observed throughput penalty in fast fading channels. We pursued the idea of a closer interaction between PHY and HARQ, and evaluated the possibility of using packet dropping (HARQ-PD) which provide a simply remedy to the throughput penalty. At the cost of more complicated implementation, the variable-length coding (HARQ-

VL) leads to a moderate—yet notable—improvement of the throughput in the region of high SNR.

The conclusions and observations we make hold for delay-insensitive applications, and do not take into account the overhead necessary to retransmit the packet at the LLC. Thus, a more realistic evaluation should differentiate between the cost of PHY and LLC transmissions. Other important challenges would be to evaluate the performance of HARQ and AMC in the interference-limited scenario or for a delay-sensitive traffic.

REFERENCES

[1] M.-S. Alouini and A. J. Goldsmith, "Adaptive modulation over Nakagami fading channels," *Kluwer Journal on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 1–2, pp. 119–143, May 2000.

[2] D. Goeckel, "Adaptive coding for time-varying channels using outdated fading estimates," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 844–855, Jun. 1999.

[3] S. Lin and J. D. J. Costello, *Error Control Coding*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 2003.

[4] 3GPP, "3GPP TS 36.321 V13.1.0 release 13 (2016-03): LTE; Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Medium access control (MAC) protocol specification."

[5] ——, "3GPP TS 36.213 V13.1.1 release 13 (2016-03): LTE; Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Physical layer procedures."

[6] J. Hagenauer, "Rate-compatible punctured convolutional codes (RCPC codes) and their applications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 389–400, Apr. 1988.

[7] G. Caire and D. Tuninetti, "The throughput of hybrid-ARQ protocols for the Gaussian collision channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1971–1988, Jul. 2001.

[8] G. Benelli, "An ARQ scheme with memory and soft error detectors," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 285–288, Mar. 1985.

[9] D. Chase, "Code combining–A maximum-likelihood decoding approach for combining an arbitrary number of noisy packets," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 385–393, May 1985.

[10] T. Kim and M. Skoglund, "On the expected rate of slowly fading channels with quantized side information," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 820–829, Apr. 2007.

[11] 3GPP, "3GPP TS 36.104 V13.3.0 release 13 (2016-03): LTE; Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access (E-UTRA); Base station (BS) radio transmission and reception."

[12] M. Jabi, M. Benjillali, L. Szczecinski, and F. Labeau, "Energy efficiency of adaptive HARQ," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 818–831, Feb. 2016.

[13] Q. Liu, S. Zhou, and G. B. Giannakis, "Cross-layer combining of adaptive modulation and coding with truncated ARQ over wireless links," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 1746–1755, Sep. 2004.

[14] L. Wan, S. Tsai, and M. Almgren, "A fading-insensitive performance metric for a unified link quality model," vol. 4, Apr. 2006, pp. 2110–2114.

[15] M. Pauli, U. Wachsmann, and S. Tsai, “Quality determination for a wireless communications link,” Apr. 2003. [Online]. Available: https://www.google.com/patents/US7231183

[16] P. Sungwoo, R. C. Daniels, and R. W. Heath Jr., “Optimizing the target error rate for link adaptation,” 2015.

[17] A. Alvarado, E. Agrell, D. Lavery, R. Maher, and P. Bayvel, “Replacing the soft-decision FEC limit paradigm in the design of optical communication systems,” *J. Lightwave Techn.*, vol. 33, no. 20, pp. 4338–4352, 2015.

[18] H. Long, W. Wang, K. Zheng, and F. Wang, “Performance analysis on conditional error ratio in HARQ transmission,” in *IEEE International Symposium on Microwave, Antenna, Propagation and EMC Technologies for Wireless Communications*, Oct. 2009, pp. 297–302.

[19] J. Gu, Y. Zhang, and D. Yang, “Modeling conditional FER for hybrid ARQ,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 384–386, May 2006.

[20] H. Zheng and H. Viswanathan, “Optimizing the ARQ performance in downlink packet data systems with scheduling,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 495–506, Mar. 2005.

[21] X. Lagrange, “Throughput of HARQ protocols on a block fading channel,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 257–259, Mar. 2010.

[22] D. Kim, B. C. Jung, H. Lee, D. K. Sung, and H. Yoon, “Optimal modulation and coding scheme selection in cellular networks with hybrid-ARQ error control,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 5195–5201, Dec. 2008.

[23] C.-H. Yu, A. Hellsten, and O. Tirkkonen, “Rate adaptation of AMC/HARQ systems with CQI errors,” May 2010, pp. 1–5.

[24] J. Ramis and G. Femenias, “Cross-layer design of adaptive multirate wireless networks using truncated HARQ,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 944–954, Mar. 2011.

[25] P. Zhang, Y. Miao, and Y. Zhao, “Cross-layer design of AMC and truncated HARQ using dynamic switching thresholds,” Apr. 2013, pp. 906–911.

[26] L. Le, E. Hossain, and A. Alfa, “Service differentiation in multirate wireless networks with weighted round-robin scheduling and ARQ-based error control,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 208–215, Feb. 2006.

[27] X. Wang, Q. Liu, and G. Giannakis, “Analyzing and optimizing adaptive modulation coding jointly with ARQ for QoS-guaranteed traffic,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 710–720, Mar. 2007.

[28] L. Le, E. Hossain, and M. Zorzi, “Queueing analysis for GBN and SR ARQ protocols under dynamic radio link adaptation with non-zero feedback delay,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3418–3428, Feb. 2007.

[29] F. Ishizaki and H. G. Uk, “Cross-layer design and analysis of wireless networks using the effective bandwidth function,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 3214–3219, Sep. 2007.

[30] G. Femenias, J. Ramis, and L. Carrasco, “Using two-dimensional Markov models and the effective-capacity approach for cross-layer design in AMC/ARQ-based wireless networks,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 4193–4203, Oct. 2009.

[31] M. Zorzi and R. Rao, “On the use of renewal theory in the analysis of ARQ protocols,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 1077–1081, Sep. 1996.

[32] R. W. Wolff, *Stochastic Modeling and the Theory of Queues*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1989.

[33] C. Shen, T. Liu, and M. Fitz, “On the average rate performance of hybrid-ARQ in quasi-static fading channels,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 3339–3352, Nov. 2009.

[34] B. Makki and T. Eriksson, “On the performance of MIMO-ARQ systems with channel state information at the receiver,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 1588–1603, May 2014.

[35] J.-P. Crouzeix and J. A. Ferland, “Algorithms for generalized fractional programming,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 52, no. 1-3, pp. 191–207, 1991.

[36] E. Uhlemann, L. K. Rasmussen, A. Grant, and P.-A. Wiberg, “Optimal incremental-redundancy strategy for type-II hybrid ARQ,” 2003, p. 448.

[37] E. Visotsky, V. Tripathi, and M. Honig, “Optimum ARQ design: a dynamic programming approach,” Jun. 2003, p. 451.

[38] N. Gopalakrishnan and S. Gelfand, “Achievable rates for adaptive IR hybrid ARQ,” in *2008 IEEE Sarnoff Symposium,*, Apr. 2008, pp. 1–6.

[39] S. M. Kim, W. Choi, T. W. Ban, and D. K. Sung, “Optimal rate adaptation for hybrid ARQ in time-correlated Rayleigh fading channels,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 968–979, Mar. 2011.

[40] L. Szczecinski, S. Khosravirad, P. Duhamel, and M. Rahman, “Rate allocation and adaptation for incremental redundancy truncated HARQ,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 2580–2590, Jun. 2013.